UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,437	05/11/2001	Victor B. Lortz	10559-461001 / P10873	7249

20985 7590 02/23/2004

FISH & RICHARDSON, PC
12390 EL CAMINO REAL
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081

EXAMINER	
ARANI, TAGHI T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2131	6

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/854,437	Applicant(s) LORTZ, VICTOR B.	
	Examiner Taghi T. Arani	Art Unit 2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 November 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-30 were pending for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9, 11-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al, US Pat. No. 6, 182,142, issued Jan 2001 and further in view of Brown et al., US Pat. No. 5, 941,947, issued Aug. 1999 (cited in IDS Paper No. 5)

As per claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-13, 15-21, 23-24, 26-27 ,Win is directed to a method and apparatus for controlling access to protected information resources see abstract.

Win's system enables users (i.e. a first resource requester) to log-in to the system once, and thereafter accesses one or more resources during an authenticated session. Win teaches that users may log in either with a digital certificate or by opening a log-in page URL with a web browser and entering a name and password (i.e. credentials), wherein if the login attempt is successful, the system presents the user with a personalized menu displaying only authorized resources to which the user has access. The user can then select and access a resource, see col. 6, lines 6-64.

Win teaches that a browser issues a request, such as " open the resource designated by this URL," and provides a URL (i.e. a resource identifier), as a parameter and a Runtime Module determines whether the requested URL is or is not a protected resource. Win teaches when the URL

is a protected resource, Runtime Module calls the authentication verification service to check whether an authenticated user is making the request and that a user is considered authenticated if the request contains a "user cookie" that can be decrypted. Win teaches when the URL is protected resource and the user is authenticated, Runtime Module calls the authorization verification service to check that the user has the right to access the protected resource.

Win further teaches a registry server managing access to a registry repository (i.e. a resource data structure) which comprises an authentication server module, a registry repository, and an access control library. The registry repository of Win is the primary data store containing data on users, resources and roles and configuration information required for the system, see col. 12, lines 22-67.

Win fails to teach " mapping the resource request to a resource identifier" and " searching a resource data structure for a resource node based on the resource identifier", required by **claims 1-2, 12, 20 and 26 .**

However, Brown teaches access rights of users of a computer network with respect to data entities which are specified by a relational data base stored on one or more security servers, see abstract.

Brown discloses a general organization of content objects within a directory service structure (i.e. a resource data structure), wherein each content object is represented as a corresponding node of one of the directory structure, see col. 12, lines 32-50, see also, Fig.2.

Brown discloses that the user's access rights with respect to the node of the directory service is determined by reading a security token associated with the node (stored as a node property), wherein the directory service generates a GetAccountrights call, specifying as parameters of the call,

the node's security token and the user's account number (i.e. mapping the resource request to a resource identifier) , see col. 15, lines 38-65.

That is, the directory service of Brown uses the GetAccountRights API to determine the access rights of the user with respect to the node , and to thereby determine whether the user is authorized to access the node, see col. 15, lines 5-26 and that this access rights information is stored within an access rights database on each security server and that the access rights database specifies, for each user of the network both (1) the content nodes that can be seen by the user via the directory service, and (2) the access operations that can be performed by the user with respect to each content node, see col. 16, lines 28-45.

Brown further teaches that the access rights values of an access control matrix(i.e. a compressed version of access rights database) are in the form of privilege level masks with each defined bit corresponding to a respective user privilege level, see col. 17, lines 5-67.

Brown's privilege levels are defined as viewer (none level), observer, user, host, sysop, sysop manager, supersysop, wherein sysop manager is given various ownership-type privileges with respect to the node, as **recited in claims 5, 15,** and that the access rights values (i.e. privilege levels) may directly specify the access operations that can be performed by the users with , for example bit 1 specifying whether the user has read/write access**, as recited in claims 6-8, 16-18 and 23.**

Brown further teaches that the GetAccountrights API returns either a 16-bit access rights value which indicated the user's access rights with respect to the nodes, or else returns a code indicating that the user is not authorized to access the node.

Brown's directory structures are in the form of directed acyclic graphs, see col. 13, lines 51-65, as **recited in claims 3,13,21 and 27.**

Brown 's data structure includes the delegation of a resource authorization level from a child node to a parent node, see col. 14, line 54 through col.15, line 26, as **recited in claims 9,19, 24 and 29.**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the registry server of the Win to that Brown's Directory service to flexibly manage user-specific access rights to different content entities when the number of subscribers may be in the millions and the number of content entities may be in the tens of thousands, where these large quantities of access rights consumes large amounts of memory and often takes unacceptably long period of time to search, see col. 1, line 38 through line 2, line 16 (Brown).

As per claims 4, 14 , 22 and 28, Win discloses that users may login in either with a digital certificate or by opening a login page URL with a web browser and entering a name and password, see col. 6, lines 6-16.

As per claims 25 and 30, Win teaches defining Administrative Roles to delegate Administration function, where centralized administration of a system is undesirable. That is, Administration Application of Win can delegate administration of users, roles, servers or the system to other administrations. This is done trough a special type of role, called Admin role. When the Admin Role is assigned to a user, that user has the right to perform administrative functions, see col. 16, lines 35-67.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al and Brown as applied to claim 9 and further in view of Carter et, US Pat. No. 6,601,171, issued Jul. 2003.

Carter discloses that the key-oriented certificate (such as SDSI) used to delegate rights among entities of distributed computing systems are well known in the art, see col. 1, lines 34-63.

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate such delegation services into Brown's computer network and Win's distributed access management to meet the urgent need in achieving seamless distribution of critical resources, and to make the power of computing resources available for more widespread use, see col. 1, lines 23-34, see also col. 13, lines 14-42.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Taghi Arani, whose telephone number is (703) 305-4274. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh, can be reached at (703) 305-9648. The Fax numbers for the organization where this application is assigned is:

(703) 872-9306

Taghi Arani

Patent Examiner

2/17/2004

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100